

that Applicants did not fully respond to the rejection of claims 89-100 and 109-116 under the judicially created doctrine of double patenting.


Nonstatutory Obviousness Type Double Patenting Rejection

In the Office communication mailed July 24, 2003, the Examiner requests a full response to the nonstatutory obviousness type double patenting rejection of claims 89-100 and 109-116 over claims 1-28 of U.S. Patent No. 6,340,591. Specifically, the Office communication states that Applicants must agree to file a terminal disclaimer upon allowance of the conflicting claims, amend the claims such that they are no longer conflicting, or point out why the rejection is in error. Accordingly, Applicants agree to file a terminal disclaimer upon allowance of the conflicting claims.

CONCLUSION

Applicants submit that it has fully responded to the Office communication dated July 24, 2003 and the non-final Office action dated November 5, 2002. Reconsideration of the rejections and allowance of all pending claims is respectfully requested. If there are any remaining issues or the Examiner believes that a telephone conversation with Applicants' Attorney would be helpful in expediting prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned at (617) 227-7400.

Respectfully submitted,



Danielle L. Herritt, Esq.  
Reg. No. 43,670  
Attorney for Applicants

LAHIVE & COCKFIELD, LLP  
28 State Street  
Boston, MA 02109  
(617) 227-7400

Dated: August 5, 2003